

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Dwight A. Littles, Jr.,	)	C/A No.: 1:23-6501-JD-SVH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	ORDER AND NOTICE
Florence County Detention Center,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

---

Dwight A. Littles, Jr. (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Florence County Detention Center (“FCDC” or “Defendant”), alleging violations of his constitutional rights. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civ. Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the district judge.

I. Factual and Procedural Background

Plaintiff alleges his Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights have been violated and he has been injured as a result. [ECF No. 1]. He generally alleges that the detainees at FCDC have been starved some days and have been punished for talking to one another. *Id.* He alleges the officer in

“Max-Seg” “open the flaps on the doors and mace us while confine inside of the cell.” *Id.*

## II. Discussion

### A. Standard of Review

Plaintiff filed his complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss a case upon a finding that the action fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted or is frivolous or malicious. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). A claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed sua sponte under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).

Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). A federal court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a pro se litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). In evaluating a pro se complaint, the plaintiff’s allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of N.Y.*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2d Cir. 1975). The mandated liberal construction afforded to pro se pleadings

means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so. Nevertheless, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts that set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, 390–91 (4th Cir. 1990).

B. Analysis

It is well-settled that only persons may act under color of state law; therefore, a defendant in a § 1983 action must qualify as a person. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983; *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 690 n.55 (1978) (noting that for purposes of § 1983, a person includes individuals and bodies politic and corporate). Courts have held that inanimate objects such as buildings, facilities, and grounds are not considered a person and do not act under color of state law. *See Nelson v. Lexington Cnty. Det. Ctr.*, No. 8:10-2988-JMC, 2011 WL 2066551, at \*1 (D.S.C. May 26, 2011) (finding that the plaintiff failed to establish that the Lexington County Detention Center, “as a building and not a person, is amenable to suit under § 1983”). In this case, Plaintiff names FCDC, which is a facility used primarily to house detainees awaiting trial in state court. Because FCDC is not a person amenable to suit under § 1983, it is subject to summary dismissal.

In addition, Plaintiff's complaint fails to state a claim for which relief may be granted. Plaintiff has failed to meet the minimal standards for filing a complaint. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), a pleading that states a claim for relief must contain a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief. Although the court must liberally construe a pro se complaint, the United States Supreme Court has made it clear a plaintiff must do more than make conclusory statements to state a claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677–78 (2009); *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). Rather, the complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim that is plausible on its face, and the reviewing court need only accept as true the complaint's factual allegations, not its legal conclusions. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678–79. Here, Plaintiff's allegations that his constitutional rights have been violated, without greater specificity, are conclusory. Further, Plaintiff may only bring his own claims and cannot advocate on behalf of other inmates.


#### NOTICE CONCERNING AMENDMENT

Plaintiff may attempt to correct the defects in his complaint by filing an amended complaint by **January 9, 2024**, along with any appropriate service documents. Plaintiff is reminded an amended complaint replaces the original complaint and should be complete in itself. *See Young v. City of Mount Ranier*, 238 F.3d 567, 572 (4th Cir. 2001) (“As a general rule, an amended pleading

ordinarily supersedes the original and renders it of no legal effect.”) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). If Plaintiff files an amended complaint, the undersigned will conduct screening of the amended complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. If Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint or fails to cure the deficiencies identified above, the undersigned will recommend to the district court that the claims be dismissed without leave for further amendment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

December 18, 2023  
Columbia, South Carolina



Shiva V. Hodges  
United States Magistrate Judge